Interview Summary	Application No	o. Applicant(s)		
	09/759,466		YAMAGISHI, MASAYUKI	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Kidest Bahta		2125	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) Kidest Bahta.	(3)			
(2) Thomas W. Perkins.	(4)			
Date of Interview: ৪/১/০শূ.				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☐ No. If Yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed:				
Identification of prior art discussed:				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Sine the Fig. 3 desicription is in the background of the specification and not been not labeled as prior art in the drawing. Examiner propose to fix the problem by examiner's amendment and Mr. Perkins authrazed to do exeminer's Amindement.				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)				
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
BEST AVAILABLE COPY				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner's sig	nature, if require	